

REMARKS

The Examiner's Action mailed on June 29, 2007, has been received and its contents carefully considered. Reconsideration of the final rejections presented therein is requested for at least the following reasons. It is respectfully submitted that this Amendment fully meets the conditions for entry after a Final rejection under 37 CFR §1.116(b)(1), as it merely complies with a requirement of form expressly set forth by the Examiner.

In this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 1. Claims 1 and 10 are the independent claims, and claims 1 and 4-18 are pending in the application. For at least the following reasons, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance.

Claim 1 was objected to for an informality, and has been amended accordingly. It is therefore respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as anticipated by *Kawa et al.* (JP 2002-297309 A). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites "A notebook computer with a hidden touch pad, comprising: a main portion including a housing portion, wherein the housing portion has an external surface, an internal surface having a receiving portion, and an identifier disposed on the external surface, *the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion*; a display connected to the main portion in a rotatable manner; and a touch pad disposed onto the receiving portion; wherein

the receiving portion of the internal surface prevents the touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere outside of the housing portion" (emphasis added).

Kawa et al. fails to disclose that "the receiving portion of the internal surface prevents the touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere outside of the housing portion" as recited in claim 1.

Further, the Office Action indicates that FIG. 3(b) of *Kawa et al.* depicts an internal surface **54** having a receiving portion, and further that Fig. 3a depicts an identifier **24** by which the touch pad **52** is exposed to the outer environment. However, FIG. 3(a) and Fig. 3(b) depict different and exclusive structures, which means if the identifier **24** exists, then the internal surface **54** and the receiving portion do not exist. Or, if the internal surface **54** and the receiving portion exist, then the identifier **24** does not exist. The receiving portion and the identifier cannot exist simultaneously in the structures taught by *Kawa et al.* In the present application, on the other hand, claim 1 clearly recites "the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion", which means that the receiving portion and the identifier exist simultaneously in the present invention. The structure claimed in claim 1 of the present application therefore differs from *Kawa et al.*, and the rejection under 35 USC §102(a) is thereby overcome.

For at least this reason, claim 1 patentably defines over *Kawa et al.*, and is allowable, together with claim 4 that depends therefrom.

Claims 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious solely over *Kawa et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7-9 depend from claim 1, which is allowable, and therefore claims 7-9 are also allowable.

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Kawa et al.* and *Garner* (US 6,501,462 B1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 depends from claim 1, which is allowable, and as *Garner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kawa et al.* with respect to claim 1, therefore claim 17 is also allowable.

Claims 5, 6 and 10-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Kawa et al.* and *Keely, Jr. et al.* (US 2002/0063694 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1, which is allowable, and as *Keely, Jr. et al.* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kawa et al.* with respect to claim 1, therefore claims 5 and 6 are also allowable.

Independent claim 10 recites "A method for manufacturing a notebook computer with a hidden touch pad, comprising: forming a housing having an external surface, an internal surface having a receiving portion, and an identifier disposed on the external surface, *the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion*; and adhering a touch pad onto the receiving portion; wherein *the receiving portion of the internal surface prevents the*

touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere outside of the housing"

(emphasis added).

Kawa et al. fails to disclose that "the receiving portion of the internal surface prevents the touch pad from being exposed to an atmosphere outside of the housing" as recited in claim 10.

In addition, neither *Kawa et al.* nor *Keely, Jr. et al.*, whether taken separately or in combination, teaches or suggests a step of forming a housing having "an identifier disposed on the external surface, *the identifier surrounding a surface corresponding to the receiving portion*", as recited in claim 10. *Kawa et al.* fails to teach or suggest such a feature as already explained with respect to claim 1, *supra*. *Keely, Jr. et al.* is relied upon in the Office Action solely for the adhesive member disclosed in ¶[0041] thereof, and also fails to teach or suggest such a feature.

For at least these reasons, claim 10 patently defines over the cited art, and is allowable. Claims 11-16 depend from claim 10, and are allowable at least because claim 10 is allowable.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over the combination of *Kawa et al.* and *Garner* further in view of *Keely, Jr. et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 18 depends from claim 10, which is allowable, and as *Garner* fails to overcome the deficiencies of *Kawa et al.* and *Keely, Jr. et al.* with respect to claim 10, therefore claim 18 is also allowable.

It is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Such action and the passing of this case to issue are requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

Should any fee be required, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,



October 1, 2007
Date

Alun L. Palmer – Reg. No. 47,838
RABIN & BERDO, PC – Cust. No. 23995
Facsimile: 202-408-0924
Telephone: 202-371-8976

ALP/pq